

1 ADAM PAUL LAXALT
2 Attorney General
3 Michael J. Bongard(Bar. No. 7997)
4 Deputy Attorney General
5 State of Nevada
6 Office of the Attorney General
7 1539 Avenue F
8 Ely, NV 89301
9 (775) 289-1632 (phone)
10 (775) 289-1653 (fax)
11 mbongard@ag.nv.gov

12 Attorney for State of Nevada, et al

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

14 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

15 JIM BASS HOLDEN,

16 Petitioner(s),

17 vs.

18 STATE OF NEVADA, et al,

19 Respondent(s).

20 Case No. 2:14-cv-0894-APG-PAL

21 **MOTION TO DISMISS PETITION FOR
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS**

22 **INTRODUCTION**

23 Respondents, by and through counsel, ADAM PAUL LAXALT, Attorney General of The State of
24 Nevada, and MICHAEL J. BONGARD, Deputy Attorney General, hereby respond to Petitioner JIM
25 BASS HOLDEN's (HOLDEN) Petition For Writ Of Habeas Corpus. This motion is based upon the
following points and authorities, the exhibits filed in this matter, and all the documents and pleadings
on file in this case.

26 **PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

27 **I. Justice Court Proceedings, Las Vegas Township Justice Court**

28 On April 26, 2004, the State filed an amended criminal complaint charging HOLDEN with
murder with use of a deadly weapon, burglary while in possession of a firearm, conspiracy to commit
murder and extortionate collection of a debt. Exh 34.¹

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
5510
5511
5512
5513
5514
5515
5516
5517
5518
5519
5520
5521
5522
5523
5524
5525
5526
5527
5528
5529
5530
5531
5532
5533
5534
5535
5536
5537
5538
5539
5540
5541
5542
5543
5544
5545
5546
5547
5548
5549
55410
55411
55412
55413
55414
55415
55416
55417
55418
55419
55420
55421
55422
55423
55424
55425
55426
55427
55428
55429
55430
55431
55432
55433
55434
55435
55436
55437
55438
55439
55440
55441
55442
55443
55444
55445
55446
55447
55448
55449
55450
55451
55452
55453
55454
55455
55456
55457
55458
55459
55460
55461
55462
55463
55464
55465
55466
55467
55468
55469
55470
55471
55472
55473
55474
55475
55476
55477
55478
55479
55480
55481
55482
55483
55484
55485
55486
55487
55488
55489
55490
55491
55492
55493
55494
55495
55496
55497
55498
55499
554100
554101
554102
554103
554104
554105
554106
554107
554108
554109
554110
554111
554112
554113
554114
554115
554116
554117
554118
554119
554120
554121
554122
554123
554124
554125
554126
554127
554128
554129
554130
554131
554132
554133
554134
554135
554136
554137
554138
554139
554140
554141
554142
554143
554144
554145
554146
554147
554148
554149
554150
554151
554152
554153
554154
554155
554156
554157
554158
554159
554160
554161
554162
554163
554164
554165
554166
554167
554168
554169
554170
554171
554172
554173
554174
554175
554176
554177
554178
554179
554180
554181
554182
554183
554184
554185
554186
554187
554188
554189
554190
554191
554192
554193
554194
554195
554196
554197
554198
554199
554200
554201
554202
554203
554204
554205
554206
554207
554208
554209
554210
554211
554212
554213
554214
554215
554216
554217
554218
554219
554220
554221
554222
554223
554224
554225
554226
554227
554228
554229
554230
554231
554232
554233
554234
554235
554236
554237
554238
554239
554240
554241
554242
554243
554244
554245
554246
554247
554248
554249
554250
554251
554252
554253
554254
554255
554256
554257
554258
554259
554260
554261
554262
554263
554264
554265
554266
554267
554268
554269
554270
554271
554272
554273
554274
554275
554276
554277
554278
554279
554280
554281
554282
554283
554284
554285
554286
554287
554288
554289
554290
554291
554292
554293
554294
554295
554296
554297
554298
554299
5542910
5542911
5542912
5542913
5542914
5542915
5542916
5542917
5542918
5542919
5542920
5542921
5542922
5542923
5542924
5542925
5542926
5542927
5542928
5542929
55429210
55429211
55429212
55429213
55429214
55429215
55429216
55429217
55429218
55429219
55429220
55429221
55429222
55429223
55429224
55429225
55429226
55429227
55429228
55429229
55429230
55429231
55429232
55429233
55429234
55429235
55429236
55429237
55429238
55429239
55429240
55429241
55429242
55429243
55429244
55429245
55429246
55429247
55429248
55429249
55429250
55429251
55429252
55429253
55429254
55429255
55429256
55429257
55429258
55429259
55429260
55429261
55429262
55429263
55429264
55429265
55429266
55429267
55429268
55429269
55429270
55429271
55429272
55429273
55429274
55429275
55429276
55429277
55429278
55429279
55429280
55429281
55429282
55429283
55429284
55429285
55429286
55429287
55429288
55429289
55429290
55429291
55429292
55429293
55429294
55429295
55429296
55429297
55429298
55429299
554292100
554292101
554292102
554292103
554292104
554292105
554292106
554292107
554292108
554292109
554292110
554292111
554292112
554292113
554292114
554292115
554292116
554292117
554292118
554292119
554292120
554292121
554292122
554292123
554292124
554292125
554292126
554292127
554292128
554292129
554292130
554292131
554292132
554292133
554292134
554292135
554292136
554292137
554292138
554292139
554292140
554292141
554292142
554292143
554292144
554292145
554292146
554292147
554292148
554292149
554292150
554292151
554292152
554292153
554292154
554292155
554292156
554292157
554292158
554292159
554292160
554292161
554292162
554292163
554292164
554292165
554292166
554292167
554292168
554292169
554292170
554292171
554292172
554292173
554292174
554292175
554292176
554292177
554292178
554292179
554292180
554292181
554292182
554292183
554292184
554292185
554292186
554292187
554292188
554292189
554292190
554292191
554292192
554292193
554292194
554292195
554292196
554292197
554292198
554292199
554292200
554292201
554292202
554292203
554292204
554292205
554292206
554292207
554292208
554292209
554292210
554292211
554292212
554292213
554292214
554292215
554292216
554292217
554292218
554292219
554292220
554292221
554292222
554292223
554292224
554292225
554292226
554292227
554292228
554292229
554292230
554292231
554292232
554292233
554292234
554292235
554292236
554292237
554292238
554292239
554292240
554292241
554292242
554292243
554292244
554292245
554292246
554292247
554292248
554292249
554292250
554292251
554292252
554292253
554292254
554292255
554292256
554292257
554292258
554292259
554292260
554292261
554292262
554292263
554292264
554292265
554292266
554292267
554292268
554292269
554292270
554292271
554292272
554292273
554292274
554292275
554292276
554292277
554292278
554292279
554292280
554292281
554292282
554292283
554292284
554292285
554292286
554292287
554292288
554292289
554292290
554292291
554292292
554292293
554292294
554292295
554292296
554292297
554292298
554292299
554292300
554292301
554292302
554292303
554292304
554292305
554292306
554292307
554292308
554292309
554292310
554292311
554292312
554292313
554292314
554292315
554292316
554292317
554292318
554292319
554292320
554292321
554292322
554292323
554292324
554292325
554292326
554292327
554292328
554292329
554292330
554292331
554292332
554292333
554292334
554292335
554292336
554292337
554292338
554292339
554292340
554292341
554292342
554292343
554292344
554292345
554292346
554292347
554292348
554292349
554292350
554292351
554292352
554292353
554292354
554292355
554292356
554292357
554292358
554292359
554292360
554292361
554292362
554292363
554292364
554292365
554292366
554292367
554292368
554292369
554292370
554292371
554292372
554292373
554292374
554292375
554292376
554292377
554292378
554292379
554292380
554292381
554292382
554292383
554292384
554292385
554292386
554292387
554292388
554292389
554292390
554292391
554292392
554292393
554292394
554292395
554292396
554292397
554292398
554292399
554292400
554292401
554292402
554292403
554292404
554292405
554292406
554292407
554292408
554292409
554292410
554292411
554292412
554292413
554292414
554292415
554292416
554292417
554292418
554292419
554292420
554292421
554292422
554292423
554292424
554292425
554292426
554292427
554292428
554292429
554292430
554292431
554292432
554292433
554292434
554292435
554292436
554292437
554292438
554292439
554292440
554292441
554292442
554292443
554292444
554292445
554292446
554292447
554292448
554292449
554292450
554292451
554292452
554292453
554292454
554292455
554292456
554292457
554292458
554292459
554292460
554292461
554292462
554292463
554292464
554292465
554292466
554292467
554292468
554292469
554292470
554292471
554292472
554292473
554292474
554292475
554292476
554292477
55429247

1 The justice court conducted a preliminary hearing on April 26, 2004. Exh 35. At the conclusion
 2 of that hearing, the justice of the peace bound the defendant to district court on all charges. Exh 36.

3 **II. Trial Court Proceedings, Eighth Judicial District Court**

4 On April 28, 2004, the State filed a criminal information. ECF 16-6. On May 11, 2004,
 5 HOLDEN entered a not guilty plea at his arraignment and waived his speedy trial. ECF 16-7 at 5.

6 On May 17, 2004, HOLDEN was transported for a psychological review. Exh 37. On June 21,
 7 2004, the State requested handwriting exemplars. Exh 38. On November 15, 2004, and October 10,
 8 2005, HOLDEN requested continuances. Exh 39. The State filed an opposition to the October request
 9 for continuance. Exh 40. HOLDEN filed a reply on October 24, 2005. Exh 42. On October 24, 2005,
 10 the trial court left the trial on calendar, but indicated that it would likely be continued. Exh 43.

11 On April 21, 2006, the State filed a motion in limine regarding the use of the defendant's
 12 journal, and to admit the prior testimony of a State's witness. ECF 16-8, 16-9. On May 1, 2006,
 13 HOLDEN filed oppositions to the State's motions in limine. ECF 16-10, 16-11.

14 On April 25, 2006, HOLDEN filed a motion in limine to preclude references to the deceased as
 15 "victim," to exclude hearsay, to preclude references to defendant's prior felony convictions, and a
 16 motion to suppress statements. Exhs 44-47. The State filed oppositions to the defense motions on April
 17 28, 2006. Exhs 48-51. The State filed a notice of witnesses on April 28, 2006. Exh 52. HOLDEN filed
 18 notice of witnesses on May 2, 2006. Exh 53.

19 On May 4, 2006, the trial court held hearings on the pending motions. ECF 16-12.²

20 On May 8, 2006, the State filed an amended information, and a second amended information on
 21 May 12, 2006. Exh 16-13, 16-15. HOLDEN filed a waiver of right to jury sentencing and a witness
 22 notice on May 8, 2006. Exhs 54-55. The State filed a motion in limine on May 9, 2008. Exh 56.

23 Trial began on May 8, 2006 and continued through May 11, 2006. Exhs 59-62. The jury found
 24 HOLDEN guilty of: burglary in possession of a firearm; conspiracy to commit murder; extortionate
 25 collection of debt, and; first degree murder with use of a deadly weapon. ECF 16-14.

26 ² The State located the missing witness, so the motion to use prior testimony was not heard. *Id* at transcript 5. The motion to
 27 prevent hearsay was reserved. *Id* at transcript 8. The motion to prevent admission of prior felonies was denied. *Id* at
 28 transcript 21. The motion to preclude reference to the decedent as "victim" was denied. *Id* at transcript 22. The trial court
 denied the motion to suppress statements. *Id* at transcript 82-83. The motion to admit the journal was granted in part. *Id* at
 transcript 52-66.

1 HOLDEN filed a sentencing memorandum on June 2, 2006. Exh 63. On June 14, 2006, the
2 clerk filed a request and order for funds for a Dr. Davis, which the trial court signed on May 11, 2006.
3 Exh 64.

4 HOLDEN appeared for sentencing on June 7, 2006. Exh 65. The trial court imposed the
5 following sentence: Count 1, burglary with a weapon, a maximum of one hundred twenty (120) months
6 with parole eligibility after twenty-four (24) months; Count 2, conspiracy to commit murder, a
7 maximum of one hundred twenty (120) months with parole eligibility after twenty-four (24) months,
8 concurrent with Count 1; Count 3, extortionate collection of a debt, a maximum of forty-eight (48)
9 months with parole eligibility after twelve (12) months, concurrent to Counts 1 and 2, and; Count 4,
10 murder with use of a deadly weapon, life without the possibility of parole plus an equal and consecutive
11 term of life without the possibility of parole for use of a deadly weapon, concurrent to Counts 1-3, and
12 the sentence in this case was ordered to run consecutive to the sentences in C202943 and C214716.
13 ECF 16-2.

14 HOLDEN filed a notice of appeal on July 14, 2006. Exh 66.

15 **III. Direct Appeal Proceedings, Nevada Supreme Court**

16 On May 31, 2007, HOLDEN filed his opening brief. ECF 16-17. On appeal, HOLDEN raised
17 the following claims:

- 18
- 19 1. Appellant's Due Process right, under the 14th Amendment, was
violated when the prosecution characterized the deceased as a "victim;"
 - 20 2. Appellant's Due Process right, under the 14th Amendment, was
violated when the court did not allow appellant's expert witness to
testify at trial;
 - 21 3. Appellant's Due Process right, under the 14th Amendment, was
violated when the court took judicial notice of a witness' prior in court
identification of a co-conspirator;
 - 22 4. Appellant's Due Process right, under the 14th Amendment, was
violated when the court allowed testimony of witness Dr. Olson
without proper foundation.

23
24 Id.

25 The State filed the answer brief on July 5, 2007. Exh 67. HOLDEN filed the reply brief on
26 August 31, 2007. Exh 68.

27 On October 17, 2007, the Nevada Supreme Court affirmed HOLDEN's convictions. ECF 16-18.

28 Remittitur issued on November 13, 2007. Exh 69.

1 **IV. State Habeas Corpus Proceedings, Eighth Judicial District Court**

2 On August 23, 2008, HOLDEN filed his state habeas corpus petition. ECF 16-19. On
3 September 8, 2008, HOLDEN filed a motion for appointment of counsel and request for evidentiary
4 hearing. Exh 70. October 23, 2008, the State filed a response to the petition. Exh 71.

5 On November 25, 2008, the district court appointed counsel for HOLDEN. Exh 72.

6 On April 9, 2010, HOLDEN filed a counseled supplemental petition. Exh 73.³ On June 29,
7 2010, the State filed a response to the supplemental petition. Exh 74.

8 On October 6, 2010, the court set the matter for an evidentiary hearing. Exh 75. The evidentiary
9 hearing began on March 18, 2011, but was continued to allow trial counsel to review the record.
10 Exh 76.

11 On April 13, 2012, the court conducted the evidentiary hearing. Exh 77. At the conclusion of
12 that hearing, the court found that HOLDEN failed to demonstrate that counsel was ineffective at trial or
13 on appeal. Id. at transcript 86. The clerk filed the written order on July 5, 2012, and filed the notice of
14 entry on July 10, 2012. Exh 78.

15 On August 8, 2012, the district court appointed counsel on appeal. Exh 79.

16 HOLDEN filed a notice of appeal on July 25, 2012. Exh 80.

17 **V. State Habeas Corpus Appellate Proceedings, Nevada Supreme Court**

18 On February 27, 2013, HOLDEN filed his opening brief. ECF 16-26. On appeal, HOLDEN
19 raised the following claims:

- 20 1. Whether the district court erred in not granting HOLDEN's petition
21 for writ of habeas corpus;
- 22 2. Whether defense counsel was ineffective in advising HOLDEN to
23 testify when testifying opened the door for the State to introduce
evidence of his prior convictions and journal entries;
- 24 3. Whether defense counsel failed to properly handle the issue of the
State's witness introducing evidence of HOLDEN's custodial status;
- 25 4. Whether defense counsel failed to request a limiting instruction prior
to introduction of HOLDEN's journal's other bad act evidence and
appellate counsel was ineffective in failing to properly raise the issue
that the district court erred in admitting the journal's other bad [act]
evidence;

28 ³ HOLDEN' filing at ECF 16-23 did not include exhibits.

5. Whether defense counsel was ineffective by conceding HOLDEN's
guilt during jury selection and closing argument;
6. Whether defense counsel was ineffective in failing to request jury
instructions that reflected his theory of the defense and failed to object
during the State's closing argument when prosecutors
mischaracterized the law and thereby confused the meaning of the jury
instructions;
7. Whether appellate counsel was ineffective in failing to raise the issue
of inadmissible hearsay evidence being admitted against HOLDEN in
violation of *Bruton* and the Sixth Amendment;
8. Whether defense counsel was ineffective for failing to object to
prosecutorial misconduct during closing arguments, and appellate
counsel was ineffective for failing to raise this issue on appeal;
9. Whether defense counsel was ineffective in failing to prepare for trial
by investigating and fully raising the issue of whether HOLDEN's
statement to police should be suppressed for a Miranda violation, and
appellate counsel was ineffective for failing to raise the issue on
appeal;
10. Whether defense counsel was ineffective in failing to present expert
and lay testimony to challenge the reliability of the(sic) Holden's
statements made during the police interrogation;
11. Whether combined derelictions by trial counsel and those of appellate
counsel warrant relief.

16 Id.⁴

17 On March 29, 2013, the State filed the answering brief. Exh 82. On April 30, 2013, HOLDEN
18 filed a reply brief. Exh 83.⁵

19 On May 13, 2014, the Nevada Supreme Court affirmed the denial of HOLDEN's state habeas
20 petition. ECF 16-27. Remittitur issued on June 11, 2014. Exh 69.

21 **VI. Federal Habeas Proceedings.**

22 HOLDEN mailed his initial federal habeas petition on May 27, 2014. ECF 7. In that petition,
23 HOLDEN raised the following claims:

24 Ground 1: Allowing the prosecution to refer to the deceased as "victim" in
25 a case of self-defense creates an inference of guilt and denies the
defendant's due process right to a fair trial;

26 ...

27

⁴ Exhibit 81 consists of the indices of the appendix and supplemental appendix filed by HOLDEN.

⁵ Exhibit 84 consists of the order striking a pleading from the record on appeal of HOLDEN's state habeas petition and.

1 Ground 2: Defendant testified at trial that his confession to law
2 enforcement was a lie to protect his family from the two Hispanic
3 perpetrators. The defendant requested the opportunity to call witness Dr.
4 Davis as an expert in the field of false confessions, but the trial court
5 denied the witness;

6 Ground 3: Due process violation when the court took judicial notice of a
7 witness' prior identification of a co-conspirator;

8 Ground 4: The trial court allowed testimony of Dr. Olson without proper
9 foundation;

10 Ground 5: Ineffective assistance of counsel at trial and on appeal;

11 Ground 6: Trial counsel failed to properly investigate witnesses, or
12 material evidence, and did not seek out an expert. Counsel failed to
13 provide to the jury evidence of a deal with an informant;

14 Ground 7: Trial counsel failed to object to the misconduct of the
15 prosecutor in the opening and closing statements;

16 Ground 8: Trial counsel failed to perform a reasonably competent
17 investigation before trial, failing to find the actual shooter in this case,
18 failed to test HOLDEN's hands and clothing, and failing to point out that
19 the weapon was not found at the scene but at the house of the shooter;

20 Ground 9: Trial counsel was ineffective in allowing the State to use
21 jailhouse snitch Steven Hall;

22 Ground 10: Ground six of the habeas presented to the district court;

23 Ground 11: Ground Seven of habeas presented to the district court;

24 Ground 12: Effective assistance of counsel "adopting grounds raised by
25 appellate attorney Connolly."

26 ECF 7.

27 HOLDEN also filed a motion for appointment of counsel. ECF 2.

28 On June 10, 2014, the Court granted the motion for appointment of counsel. ECF 7. The federal
1 public defender filed a notice of conflict on July 7, 2014. ECF 9. On August 28, 2014, the Court
2 appointed counsel. ECF 12.

3 On October 29, 2014, HOLDEN filed a counseled, first amended petition. ECF 16. In that
4 petition, HOLDEN raised the following claims:

5 Ground 1: Appellant's Due Process Right under the 14th Amendment was
6 violated when the prosecution characterized the deceased as a "victim;"
7
8 ...

1 Ground 2: Appellant's right to present a defense under the 6th
2 Amendment was violated when the court did not allow appellant's expert
witness to testify at trial;

3 Ground 3: Appellant's Due Process right under the 14th Amendment was
4 violated when the Court took judicial notice of a witness' prior "in court"
identification of a co-conspirator;

5 Ground 4: Petitioner's Due Process right under the 14th Amendment was
6 violated when the court allowed testimony of witness Dr. Olson without
proper foundation;

7 Ground 5: The district court erred in denying HOLDEN's petition for writ
8 of habeas corpus;

9 Ground 6: Trial counsel was ineffective in advising HOLDEN to testify,
which would allow his prior convictions to be admitted as impeachment,
and in keeping with this strategy, even after the state rested without
introducing the contents of HOLDEN's "journal;"

11 Ground 7: Trial counsel was ineffective in handling the prior conviction
12 issue and burdened HOLDEN's right to appear before the jury as an
innocent man;

13 Ground 8: A.) Trial counsel was ineffective in failing to request a
14 limiting instruction prior to introduction of the journal's order bad act
evidence and

15 B.) Appellant counsel was ineffective in failing to properly raise the issue
that the district court erred in admitting the bad act evidence;

16 Ground 9: Trial counsel was ineffective in conceding his client's possible
17 guilt during jury selection and again during closing argument;

18 Ground 10: A.) Trial counsel was ineffective in failing to request
instructions consistent with his theory of the defense and in failing to
object during the State's closing argument when the State
mischaracterized the law and thereby confused the meaning of the jury
instructions and lessened the burden of proof required to convict;

21 B.) Appellant counsel was ineffective for failing to raise
the issue of the State's improper argument on appeal;

22 Ground 11: Appellant counsel was ineffective in raising the issue of
23 inadmissible hearsay being admitted against HOLDEN in violation of
Bruton;

24 Ground 12: A.) Trial counsel was ineffective for failing to object to
prosecutorial misconduct during closing arguments;

25 B.) Appellant counsel was ineffective for failing to raise
the issue of prosecutorial misconduct on appeal;

26 Ground 13: A.) Trial counsel was ineffective in failing to prepare for
27 trial by investigating and fully raising the issue of whether HOLDEN's
statement to the police should be suppressed for a Miranda violation;

B.) Appellate counsel was ineffective for failing to raise the issue on appeal;

Ground 14: Trial counsel was ineffective in failing to present expert and lay testimony to challenge the reliability of HOLDEN's statements made during the police investigation;

Ground 15: Cumulative error of trial and appellate counsel.

ECF 16.

On October 29, 2014, counsel also filed a motion for stay and a motion for enlargement of time to file a second amended petition. ECF 14-15. On April 14, 2015, the Court granted the motion to stay proceedings. ECF 17.

On May 11, 2015, counsel filed a motion to withdraw. ECF 18. The Court appointed new counsel on February 11, 2016. ECF 19.

On May 3, 2016, counsel filed a motion to reopen the case. ECF 22.

On February 6, 2017, the Court directed Respondents to answer or respond to the petition.
ECF 23.

Respondents now file a motion to partially dismiss the petition because HOLDEN's first amended petition presents several unexhausted claims.

ARGUMENT AND LAW

I. Applicable Law

The Anti-terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act, “AEDPA” governs these proceedings. 28 U.S.C. § 2254. In order to obtain federal habeas relief after the passage of AEDPA, a petitioner must exhaust his claims in state court. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(1)(A). Respondents do not waive exhaustion in these proceedings. Respondents also deny all allegations in the amended petition, with the exception of those factual findings that have been made by Nevada state courts.

II. Exhaustion

Exhaustion of state remedies is a prerequisite to a federal court's consideration of claims presented in a petition for writ of habeas corpus. 28 U.S.C. 2254(b). The exhaustion doctrine is based on a policy of federal-state comity designed to give state courts the initial opportunity to correct alleged constitutional deprivations. See *Picard v. Conner*, 404 U.S. 270, 275 (1971). It requires the habeas

1 petitioner to “fairly present” the “substance” of his federal habeas corpus claim to the state courts.
2 *Anderson v. Harless*, 459 U.S. 4, 6, 103 S.Ct 276, 277 (1982) (per curiam); *Gagne v. Fair*, 835 F.2d 6,
3 7 (1st Cir. 1987).

4 The “fair presentation” requirement is only satisfied when the claim has been presented to the
5 highest state court by describing the operative facts and legal theory upon which the federal claim is
6 based. *Anderson*, 459 U.S. at 6; *Batchelor v. Cupp*, 693 F.2d 859, 862 (9th Cir. 1982). Additionally, a
7 state prisoner does not "fairly present" a claim to a state court if that court must read beyond a petition
8 or a brief (or a similar document) that does not alert it to the presence of a federal claim. *Baldwin v.*
9 *Reese*, 541 U.S. 27, 32, 124 S.Ct 1347, 1351 (2004). If the federal claim has not been so “fairly
10 presented” to the state’s highest court, there is a failure to exhaust. *Roettgen v. Copeland*, 33 F.3d 36,
11 38 (9th Cir. 1994).

12 When an argument is not framed or considered in federal constitutional terms and only state
13 case law is cited, there is no fair presentation unless the case analyzes a constitutional issue. See
14 *Anderson*, 459 U.S. at 6 n.3, 103 S.Ct. at 277 n.3. A state law issue may not be transformed into a
15 federal constitutional issue merely by asserting a violation of due process. *Langsford v. Day*, 110 F.3d
16 1380, 1389 (9th Cir. 1996).

17 There is a failure to exhausts if the claim is presented to the state’s highest court but is presented
18 in a procedurally deficient manner. *Castille v. Peoples*, 489 U.S. 346, 351 (1989); *Roettgen v.*
19 *Copeland*, 33 F.3d 36, 38 (9th Cir. 1994). The petitioner has the duty to prove and plead exhaustion.
20 *Sechrest v. Ignacio*, 943 F.Supp. 1245, 1247 (D. Nev. 1996), citing *Williams v. Craven*, 460 F.2d 1253
21 (9th Cir. 1972).

22 Waiver of exhaustion by a respondent must be express. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(3). Respondents do
23 not waive exhaustion.

24 A “mixed petition,” containing both exhausted and unexhausted claims, must be dismissed, or
25 otherwise resolved, pursuant to *Rose v. Lundy*, 455 U.S. 509, 102 S. Ct. 1198, 71 L. Ed. 2d 379 (1982)
26 and its progeny.

27 . . .

28 . . .

1 **III. Holden Presents The Court With A Mixed Petition**

2 **A. Ground 3**

3 In Ground Three of his amended federal petition, HOLDEN alleges that he was denied due
 4 process when the trial court took judicial notice of a witness' prior identification of a co-conspirator.
 5 ECF 16 at 14.

6 This claim is unexhausted because HOLDEN never presented the claim to the Nevada Supreme
 7 Court as a federal issue.

8 On direct appeal, HOLDEN challenged the district court taking judicial notice of a witness'
 9 identification. ECF 16-17 at 18. Supporting his argument, HOLDEN cited NRS 47.130 and a Nevada
 10 Supreme Court case, *Occhiuto v. Occhiuto*, 625 P.2d 568 (Nev. 1981). Neither NRS 47.130 nor
 11 *Occhiuto* discuss "Due Process," federal case law or the federal constitution. In *Occhiuto*, the Nevada
 12 Supreme Court discussed NRS 47.130, and held that the general rule that courts should not take notice
 13 of records in other cases "is not so inflexible in its application that under no can judicial notice be
 14 invoked to take cognizance of the record in another case." 625 P.2d at 569.

15 A petitioner cannot transform a state law claim into a federal constitutional claim by citing "due
 16 process." *Langsford v. Day*, 110 F.3d at 1389.

17 In this case, HOLDEN presented the Nevada Supreme Court with a state law claim on direct
 18 appeal. HOLDEN never asked the Nevada Supreme Court to analyze the federal component of the state
 19 law claim presented on direct appeal by presenting federal constitutional law, nor did he analyze the
 20 issue using federal cases or even state cases citing or analyzing federal law. See *Anderson*, 459 U.S. at
 21 6 n.3.

22 Because HOLDEN failed to present Ground 3 as a federal constitutional claim in state court, his
 23 failure to exhaust is readily apparent and inexcusable under AEDPA. A finding HOLDEN failed to
 24 exhaust Ground 3 is the only reasonable finding based upon the state court record.

25 **B. Ground 4**

26 In Ground 4 of his amended federal petition, HOLDEN alleges a Due Process violation because
 27 the trial court admitted the testimony of the State's expert without proper foundation. ECF 16 at 15.

28 ...

1 The analysis of this claim in order to determine exhaustion is similar to the analysis of Ground
 2 3. In his direct appeal brief, HOLDEN presented the Ground 4 claim with no references to federal law,
 3 the federal constitution, or state law that analyzed or applied federal law.

4 The direct appeal brief cited NRS 51.135, and *Hamm v. Sheriff*, 523 P.2d 1301 (Nev. 1974).
 5 ECF 16-17 at 19. *Hamm* was a three page decision that dismissed a case because evidence (two store
 6 receipts) was improperly admitted. *Id.* Neither *Hamm* nor NRS 51.135, discuss due process, contain
 7 citations to federal law, or conduct a review of a claim under a due process analysis.

8 *Langsford* and *Anderson*, as cited above, support a finding that HOLDEN's arguments on direct
 9 appeal do not constitute exhaustion of the federal claim presented in the first amended petition.

10 **C. Ground 8(B)**

11 In Ground 8, HOLDEN raises two claims: first, trial counsel was ineffective for failing to request a limiting instruction, and; second, appellate counsel was ineffective for failing to raise the issue on direct appeal. ECF 16 at 18.

14 In HOLDEN's appeal from the denial of his state habeas petition, HOLDEN's brief never raised the claim, except for a conclusory statement tacked on the end of a lengthy argument that trial counsel was ineffective. ECF 16-26 at 33. This single sentence does not satisfy exhaustion of the appellate counsel claim.

18 Respondents request the Court find that HOLDEN's Ground 8(B) ineffective assistance of appellate counsel claim is unexhausted.

20 **IV. Ground 5 Fails To State A Claim**

21 In Ground 5 of the amended federal petition, HOLDEN alleges "the district court erred in denying HOLDEN's petition for writ of habeas corpus."⁶ ECF 16 at 15.

23 Review of HOLDEN's federal claims are conducted pursuant to AEDPA and a claim that the state district court erred in denying the state petition is not properly before this Court as a stand-alone claim.

26 ...

27 ⁶ Respondents are not certain that HOLDEN is presenting this as a claim because HOLDEN's amended petition assigned letters to what appear to be the claims. In the interests of thoroughness, Respondents are asking the Court to find that this claim, if an actual claim, is not properly before the Court.

CONCLUSION

For the above-stated reasons, the Court should grant Respondents' motion to partially dismiss.

DATED this 20th day of March, 2017

ADAM PAUL LAXALT
Attorney General

By: s/ Michael J. Bongard
MICHAEL J. BONGARD (Bar NO. 07997)
Deputy Attorney General

1
2 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**
3

4 I certify that I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the United States
5 District Court by using CM/ECF system on March 20, 2017. Participants in the case who are registered
6 CM/ECF users will be served by the appellate CM/ECF system.

7 Julian Gregory, Esq.
8 324 S. 3rd St. , Suite 1
9 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

10 /s/S. Summers
11 An Employee of the Office of the Attorney General
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28